



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/013,981

12/10/2001

Chia-Hui Han

JCLA7632

1935

23900

7590

08/06/2008

J C PATENTS, INC.  
4 VENTURE, SUITE 250  
IRVINE, CA 92618

EXAMINER

LI, SHI K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* CHIA-HUI HAN

---

Appeal 2008-2480  
Application 10/013,981  
Technology Center 2600

---

Decided: August 6, 2008

---

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, ROBERT E. NAPPI,  
and MARC S. HOFF *Administrative Patent Judges*.

NAPPI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the rejection of claims 1 through 14.

We reverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

## INVENTION

The invention is directed to a method for use in the field of infrared transmission. The method involves testing an infrared head to determine the brand name and transmission mode of the transmission head so that the infrared controller can control the head. See page 3 of Appellant's Specification. Claim 1 is representative of the invention and is reproduced below:

1. A transmission method for identifying infrared transmission head functions through an infrared controller coupled to an infrared transmission head, said method comprising the following steps:
    - setting said infrared controller in a test circuit mode;
    - selecting a test brand name and its corresponding test transmission mode of the infrared transmission head among a plurality of brand names;
    - executing an operation of programming said infrared controller according to the test transmission mode corresponding to the test brand name of said infrared transmission head;
    - said infrared controller's sending out transmission test data corresponding to the test brand name to the infrared transmission head;
    - said infrared controller's receiving test data according to the test transmission mode corresponding to the test brand name of said infrared transmission head;
    - registering said test brand name and associated test transmission mode of said infrared transmission head when said transmission test data and said received test data are identical; and
    - operating said infrared transmission head according to the registered test brand name and test transmission mode of said infrared transmission head;
- wherein said infrared controller's sending out transmission test data and said infrared controller's receiving test data occur concurrently.

## REFERENCES

|          |              |               |
|----------|--------------|---------------|
| Kamon    | US 5,726,645 | Mar. 10, 1998 |
| Chiloyan | US 6008,735  | Dec. 28, 1999 |
| Weber    | US 6,185,620 | Feb. 6, 2001  |
| Verzulli | US 6,426,820 | Jul. 30, 2002 |

## REJECTIONS AT ISSUE

Claims 1 through 3, and 6 through 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verzulli in view of Kamon and Chiloyan. The Examiner's rejection is on pages 3 and 4 of the Answer.

Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verzulli in view of Kamon, Chiloyan and Weber. The Examiner's rejection is on pages 4 and 5 of the Answer.

Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verzulli in view of Kamon, Chiloyan and Appellant's admitted prior art. The Examiner's rejection is on pages 5 and 6 of the Answer.

Throughout the opinion, we make reference to the Brief (received March 13, 2006), Reply Brief (received July 27, 2006) and the Answer (mailed October 17, 2007) for the respective details thereof.

## ANALYSIS

Appellant contends, on pages 4 through 7 of the Brief, that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 3, and 6 through 12 is in error. Appellant reasons that the combination of the prior art does not teach

“identifying infrared transmission head functions through an infrared controller coupled to an infrared transmission head” as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Br. 6. In response, the Examiner states on pages 7 and 8 of the Answer:

Verzulli teaches in FIG. 1 a self-test arrangement for an infrared transceiver. It comprises a microcontroller with internal memory (ROM and RAM) and external memory (EEPROM) for controlling the infrared transceiver. Verzulli states in col. 3, line 4 that the EEPROM contains a manufacturer/model code. The difference between Verzulli and the claimed invention, in terms of the problem to be solved, is that Verzulli only stores one manufacture[r] code while the claimed invention is capable of testing a plurality of brand names. Confronted with such a problem, a skilled artisan would search for prior art that teach method for handling a plurality of brand names or manufacturers. Kamon et al. is such a prior art that teaches storing of a plurality of manufacturers in memory and selecting an appropriate one for operation. Kamon et al. teaches in col. 2, lines 60-66 storing command signals for instructing predetermined operations associated with a plurality of manufacturers. Chiloyan is another example, which teaches in col. 4, lines 45-55 storing settings for various models, brands or types of devices so that the same controller 12 and transmitter 18 can be used for controlling devices of the various brands. Such approach eliminates the need of different microcontrollers for different infrared transceivers. In other words, a single so-called "universal" microcontroller can be used for any brand names whose driving parameters have been stored in memory. Such combination of Kamon and Verzulli is desirable because it allows the use of a single microcontroller to test infrared transceivers made by various manufacturers, as recognized by Kamon and explained in col. 1, lines 25-33 of Kamon. Without knowing the brand name of a transceiver, the combination also allows the selection of appropriate driving setting based on self-test results by trying settings for different brand names and choosing the one that gives the best performance.

While we agree that the teachings of Verzulli, Kamon and Chiloyan may be combined such that an infrared remote control (e.g., stereo, TV, VCR, remote control) is more easily programmed for the various electronic devices that the remote control may control, we disagree with the Examiner's finding that such a combination meets the claims. Independent claims 1 and 6 recite limitations directed to infrared controller testing and operating the infrared transmission head based upon selected data concerning brand name of the infrared transmission head. Verzulli teaches testing a remote control for an appliance that makes use of infrared transmitter(s). See Abstract and figures 1 and 2. Verzulli does not discuss that there are different test data based upon the brand of infrared transmitter(s) in the remote control. The discussion in column 3, line 4, which the Examiner relies upon as teaching the model of the transmission head, discusses the device being controlled, i.e., the electronic component the remote control is operating, not the elements of the remote control being controlled by the infrared controller in the remote control (microprocessor item 14). Further, the references to Kamon and Chiloyan are also directed to programming the remote control to drive various devices (i.e., a universal remote control) and do not teach setting up different test data for the infrared controller to use in testing the infrared transmitter. Thus, we do not find that the combination of the references teaches the device recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 3, and 6 through 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verzulli in view of Kamon and Chiloyan.

The Examiner's rejections of dependent claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 rely upon the combination of Verzulli in view of Kamon and Chiloyan to teach

Appeal 2008-2480  
Application 10/013,981

the limitations of independent claims 1 and 6. The Examiner has not found, nor do we find, that the additional teachings of Weber and the admitted prior art remedy the noted deficiency in the rejection of claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejections of claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**ORDER**

The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

**REVERSED**

KIS

J. C. PATENTS, INC.  
4 VENTURE, SUITE 250  
IRVINE, CA 92618